

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
WESTERN DIVISION**

**CORR WIRELESS
COMMUNICATIONS, L.L.C.,
CELLULAR SOUTH, INC., and
CELLULAR SOUTH LICENSES, LLC**

PLAINTIFFS

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:12CV36-A-A

**AT&T, INC., AT&T MOBILITY LLC,
MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC.,
MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED, and
JOHN DOES 1-10**

DEFENDANTS

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR JURISDICTIONAL DISCOVERY

Plaintiffs have moved to conduct limited jurisdictional discovery against AT&T Inc. in response to AT&T Inc.’s third motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. (Docket 133, 141).¹ Defendants oppose the motion (Docket 153, 154) asserting that plaintiffs’ have not established the preliminary showing of personal jurisdiction in order to obtain jurisdictional discovery, and the proposed discovery is a fishing expedition seeking information relating to the merits of the case. Docket 154. The court has reviewed the motion, response, and reply (Docket 160) and concludes that plaintiffs’ motion should be **DENIED**.

To obtain leave to engage in jurisdictional discovery, plaintiff must make “a preliminary showing of jurisdiction.” *Fielding v. Hubert Burda Media, Inc.*, 415 F.3d 419, 429 (5th Cir. 2005). Plaintiff has not satisfied the preliminary showing necessary to obtain jurisdictional discovery. Additionally, the court has reviewed the proposed discovery requests, which do not appear to relate to any jurisdiction issues, but instead appear to be a fishing expedition to obtain

¹ The first two motions to dismiss were granted by Judge Aycock. Docket ## 99 & 115.

evidence relating to the merits of the case rather than the issue of whether AT&T is subject to personal jurisdiction in the Northern District of Mississippi. For these reasons, plaintiffs' motion for jurisdictional discovery is **DENIED**.

This, the 5th day of June, 2013.

/s/ S. Allan Alexander
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE